

Comprehensive Review for the Center for Academic Support

Spring 2013

The following provides an outline of the required elements for a comprehensive program review for Student Services Programs. Upon completion of this report, please upload your document in the unit/program review application data/documents tab.

For all programs:

Customer Satisfaction

Summarize the results of your unit/program's "customer" service satisfaction survey(s).

Customer Satisfaction

The Center does bi-annual satisfaction surveys. Our last customer satisfaction survey was completed in Fall 2011. The survey was a two-part survey that asked one overall question about the help they received at the Center and then asked students to respond to questions concerning either Reading and Writing Consultants or Peer Tutoring. Students were asked to complete the survey after they had worked with a Consultant or Peer Tutor during a two week time period. This survey was given to students who use the reading and writing consultant service and the peer-tutoring services. The survey asked students to rate their satisfaction with both the Reading and Writing Consultant and tutoring services they received in the Center. Overall, 90% of students who completed a survey reflected that they were happy with the services they received and only 1% of those surveyed responded that they were not happy with our services. Of those who responded to questions about working with a consultant, 85% answered that working with a consultant has affected the way they work on a paper or assignment and 78% of respondents reflected that they believed working with the consultant has helped them succeed in college courses and only 5% felt that working with consultants has not helped them in college courses. Of those students who worked with peer tutors, 87% of respondents reflected that peer tutors "always" encourage them to use different strategies (using graphs, pictures, predicting etc) to solve problems, which helps them to solve similar problems/assignments. In addition, 79% reported that the tutor "always" helped them to learn skills such as reading the textbook effectively and taking effective notes that aided them to be successful in other courses.

Next customer satisfaction survey will be completed in Fall of 2013.

Assessment Summary

Summarize your PSLO/CSLO assessment reports and your assessment plans. Summarize any changes that you are making to your PSLOs.

TUTORING

SLOS and TLOS created in Spring and Fall 2009. These were updated in November, 2012.

Tutor Learning Outcomes

(Adopted & Revised November, 9th 2012)

1. Utilize appropriate methods of inquiry during a tutoring session and
 - a. Modify the tutoring session/inquiry method according to the student's need along with...
 - b. Identifying additional learning needs and recommending appropriate learning support services.
2. Model ethical and professional behavior of an employee at LMC.
3. How has diversity affected or impacted your (education) and your experience as a tutor. (This TLO is still under construction).

Student Learning Outcomes

(Adopted & Revised November, 9th 2012)

1. Describe and locate the most appropriate tutoring services for their need(s)
2. Demonstrate increased confidence in their abilities as a student.
3. Apply the study skills developed through tutoring to LMC course work. Study skills are defined as note taking, time management, effective use of materials etc.

Assessment reports:

Currently the TST have assessed three SLOs:

Assessment I: Students working with a tutor will describe and locate the most appropriate tutoring service(s) for their need(s).

Students who use tutoring services were given a survey depending on if they used "in-class" tutoring or "drop-in" tutoring which asked students to report the reason for visiting a tutor, and if they used any other services. The survey also asked students to list services and how they found out about the services. For students to be proficient, they must list the Center for Academic Support and at least one other resource.

The team found that 35% of our students who used "in-class" tutoring to be proficient. Of which, 32% learned this information from their tutors. For the students who used the "drop-in" service, 39% were proficient and of this, 29% reported they were provided this information from their tutors. The results suggest that more emphasis on resource awareness for tutors is needed.

This SLO will remain in the assessment rotation. Assessment results will be compared.

Assessment II. (Sp 11) Students working with a tutor will demonstrate increased confidence in their abilities as a student.

PSLO: Library and Learning Support Services: Apply Knowledge learned and competencies gained from using Library and Learning Support Services to academic coursework and assignments.

All students, both in Pittsburg and Brentwood who used tutoring services were given a survey that asked students to rate how tutoring has affected their confidence in six areas. The scale used ran from 1: decreased confidence to 5: greatly increased.

In each of the questions six questions asked students averaged at 3.3 through 4.5.

Students scored an average of 3.3 when asked about note taking skills with most students noting that there was not any change to their note taking abilities. When asked about explaining material in their own words, students predominately answered that they saw an increase in their ability. The majority of students with an average of 4.4 reflected that their abilities greatly increased when attempting exercises/assignments on their own. Similar results were found for learning and retaining coursework which resulted in an average of 4.2. The highest result, with an average score of 4.5, was seen in the survey came from question 6: “seeking help outside the class time from tutors or instructors.

The results show that tutoring does increase confidence in student’s abilities in learning material independently and attempting and seeking help on their own suggesting student s are motivated by learning and that tutoring helps student to understand that they must take responsibility to learn the material. However, it also seems that student’s confidence is not affected when it comes to note-taking and finding information on their own. This is may be happening because tutors are not discussing this in tutorials and/or students and tutors are not placing any value on these when it comes to tutorials. These results have been used to place more emphasize on the note-taking skills in tutor training, and using this skill in a tutoring session.

Changes:

Both the SLOs and TLOS were reviewed and revised by the Tutor Support Team, October 25, 2012. The team decided to keep the four student learning outcomes as written; however, changes were made to the five tutor learning outcomes as noted above.

Assessment Plan:

SLOs will be assessed once a year. TLOs will also be assessed once a year.

SLOS and TLOS were reviewed and changed in Fall 2012. The Assessment plan was also reviewed this semester.

Assessment Plan:

	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
SLO #1	Completed										Cycle 2	
SLO #2			Completed									
SLO #3					Completed							
SLO #4							Scheduled					

	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
TLO #1										Scheduled		Cycle 2
TLO #2								Scheduled				
TLO #3						In Progress						

CONSULTATION

The last time an assessment was conducted to directly assess the impact of consultation on student learning was in Spring 2005. The following summarizes the results of that assessment:

Background: This is the first assessment project conducted in the Reading and Writing Center that attempted to analyze the impact of writing consultation on student paper revisions. This project focused on the first of three research papers assigned in Humanities 2LS, a course in ethical inquiry that was required for the LMC Associate's Degree. In the year preceding this project, the Director of the Reading and Writing Center worked with instructors teaching Humanities 2LS to revise the requirements for the research paper and the accompanying student handbook.

Research Question: Do HUM 2LS students revise their papers based on advice received from the writing consultant? If students follow the advice of the writing consultant, to what degree is the paper modified?

Analysis:

Do HUM 2LS students revise their papers based on advice received from the writing consultant? Yes, 62% of the students revised their papers based on consultant's advice.

If students follow the advice of the writing consultant, to what degree is the paper modified? Of the 18 students who revised their papers based on consultant's advice (mean "match" score 3-5), 100% of the revisions were significant (mean "degree" score 2-3).

Is there a relationship between the student's use of consultant's advice in revision and grade on the paper? Yes, 92% of the students who followed the consultants' advice made a passing grade on the paper; 80% of the students who made a D or an F on the paper did not follow the consultants' advice.

Between Spring 2005 and Spring 2011, there were no direct assessments of student learning as a result of sessions with faculty consultants. This was due to the fact that in 2008-2009, when a second assessment would have been planned and implemented, there was a major change in the organization structure of the CORE. At that time, coordination of college-wide tutoring was merged with faculty consultation in the Center, and attention necessarily shifted to designing, implementing and assessing learning outcomes for the tutoring program, as detailed above.

In Spring 2011, we returned to the design of a study to assess student learning as a result of consultation sessions with faculty consultants in the CORE. A good deal of time was spent designing what was referred to as “The Regulars Study”. That study was intended to answer the following question:” *How do appointments with consultants fit into and benefit the writing process for major papers?*

The general idea was to have in-depth interviews with a relatively small number of students to find out the benefits and effects of use of the Core in the writing process for major papers. However, in the semester that the study was to be implemented, Fall 2011, cutbacks in funding for the CORE, required the faculty lead who would have carried out the study, to instead spend hours actually consulting with students to cover the shortfall in services. Thus, the study was never done.

In Fall 2012, new faculty leads for the CORE began working on a new plan to assess student learning as a result of faculty consultations. That plan grew out of professional development workshops with the faculty consultants and their input on both difficulties students seemed to experience during consultations, and ways that might help students get more out of the sessions in terms on long term learning. The new assessment plan will be piloted in Spring 2013 and fully implemented in Fall 2013.

Staffing Structure

Analyze your unit/program’s staffing structure including 3 year FTE trend data.

Staffing Structure:

One full time Coordinator

A part- time hourly assistant.

Faculty lead: .25% release time.

1.0 load assigned for faculty consultants.

4-6 Student Assistants and 25-30 tutors

CONSULTATION

The number of faculty consultants working in the CORE over the last 3 years was as follows:

Fall 09	Spr 10	Fall 10	Spr 11	Fall 11	Spr 12
18 (5 FT)	20 (7 FT)	22 (6 FT)	16 (4 FT)	16 (3FT)	18 (3FT)

The majority of faculty consultants are part time faculty.

The number of consultation hours provided to students by these faculty is as follows:

Fall 09	Spr 10	Fall 10	Spr 11	Fall 11	Spr 12
56 hours	78 hours	60 hours	45 hours	45 hours	43 hours

Beginning in Fall 2011, we were directed to limit total faculty consultants to 40 hours per week, due to college wide budget constraints. This has limited student access to high quality academic support, and falls far short of the number of consultation hours that would be ideal: 76 hours per week (66 hours in Pittsburg and 10 hours in Brentwood.) The below details the ideal number of hours required for consultation with students.

Center Hourly Needs

Main Campus

Monday – Thursday

9 a.m. – 2 p.m. (two consultants)

5 hours/day X 4 days=20

20 hours x 2 consultants =

40 hours

2 p.m. – 7 p.m. (one consultant)

5 hours/day X 4 days = 20 hours

20 hours

Friday

9 a.m. – 11 a.m. (two consultants)

2 hours X 2 consultants = 4hour

4 hours

11 a.m. – 1 p.m. (one consultant)

2 hours

Sub-total for Main Campus

66 hours

Brentwood Center

Ten hours one consultant

with at least One? Two nights?

Sub-total for Brentwood

10 hours

TOTAL HOURS:

76 hours

Budget Analysis

Summarize your unit/program’s budget analysis including 3 year budget trend data.

The total amount spent for services provided in the CORE, excluding compensation for full time faculty who worked in the CORE*, was as follows:

2009 -2010	2010-2011	2011 -2012
77,393 **	125, 513	124, 598

** The 2009-2010 budget did not include a line item for college-wide tutors. This began in 2010- 2011. These funds were used to:

1. Pay part time faculty for consulting in the CORE (This amount decreased from 60,619 in 09-10 to 47,728 in 11-12.)
2. College-wide tutors (This was 52,085 in 10 -11 and 55, 510 in 11-12.)
3. Student Assistants
4. Hourly Classified Assistant
5. Supplies

*Full time faculty are compensated with load for working in the CORE.

Facilities

Report on your unit/program's current and future use of facilities.

The Center for Academic Support is housed in the Core complex, CO 300.

The Center consists of a main area that, one large study room and one small study room. In addition there is one office and a small storage closet, and one large room used for daily business.

The main area is used principally for reading and writing consultations with students, professors holding offices hours for the "Professor is in," student study groups, and small (1-2) tutoring groups. The main area is also equipped with 8 student use computers, a printer and a copy machine; there is also a specific area for students to use lap-tops.

The primary use of the small study room (CO 302) is for small group (1-4) tutoring; this room is also used by reading and writing consultants when privacy is needed for such things as reading aloud, distracted students, upset students etc. This room is also used for test proctoring. (This is not an official function of the Center; however, it is a service we provide time-to-time.) When this room is not being used for these purposes, students may use it for a quiet area to study and/or conduct group study sessions. It is anticipated that this room will continue to be used for these purposes.

The larger study room (CO 304) is primary used for tutoring larger groups of students, 4 –20, workshops and any endeavors related to functions in the Center, professional development workshops, study slams, tutor training etc. It is anticipated that this area will continue to use this area for these services, however, it is hoped that the Center will offer more workshops, study sessions and that our services will continue to expand; this area is and will be a vital part of that expansion.

Equipment and Technology

Report on your unit/program's current technology and equipment infrastructure.

Equipment and Technology:

The Center currently has an 8 person computer area for students to work on course assignments, a printer and copying machine. In addition, the Center has 20 lap-top computers that are available for student use.

The larger study room (C0 304) contains one smart podium for faculty and tutor use.

Professional Development

Summarize the past (2 – 5 years) and present professional development activities of your unit/program's members, and analyze your future professional development needs.

Professional Development for Consultants

In October 2012, twelve consultants who work in the Center for Academic Support reviewed professional development activities provided at monthly meetings for the last three years. The activities could broadly be categorized as:

1. Administrative Policies and Procedures
2. Diversity Training
3. Training in Writing/Reading Topics
4. Training in Discipline Specific Topics, e.g. writing across the curriculum

In order to review the professional development provided in these categories, four poster boards were placed around the room, each detailing the specific training topics that had been included in each category. The twelve consultants worked in 4 groups of three people each, circulating around the room to discuss their assessment of the effectiveness of the training provided. After about a 10 minute discussion, each small group rated the effectiveness of the professional development provided in that category on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being most effective.

Their average ratings are as follows: (ratings of each of the four groups noted in parentheses)

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|
| 1. | Administrative Policies and Procedures : 3.1 [2.5 + 3+3+4] | <i>Somewhat effective</i> |
| 2. | Diversity Training: 3.2 [2+2+4+5] | <i>Somewhat effective</i> |
| 3. | Training in Writing/Reading Topics : 4 [3+4+4+5] | <i>Effective</i> |
| 4. | Training in Discipline Specific Topics: 3.7 [3+4+4+4] | <i>Effective.</i> |

Comments were also included in reviewing the effectiveness of training in each category. The following statements summarize these comments:

- Professional development provided needs to tie more directly to the work consultants do in a 30 minute consulting session.
- When faculty across the curriculum are asked to come in to make a presentation to consultants, they should be better prepared to address how consultants can help their students.
- Administrative topics, such as how to fill out timecards, are necessary, but not directly helpful in working with students in the Center.
- Presentations from faculty across the curriculum are interesting, but are of limited value if consultants see very few of those students in the Center.

In addition to reviewing the effectiveness of professional development over the last three years, consultants also suggested activities they would like to see in the future. These included:

- Training in how much “help” is “too much” and is actually counterproductive in terms of student learning
- Discussion of actual consulting sessions in the Center that were challenging for the consultant. E.g. what would you do if... scenarios
- More training in helping students with reading assignments and their integration into writing assignments.

Professional Development for Center Staff

The faculty lead and Lab Coordinator attended the International Writing Center’s Association 2010 Summer Institute. Topics for this conference included:

- Writing Center Pedagogy
- Diversity
- Writing Center Leadership
- Writing Center Research and Assessment
- Writing Center Tutor Development

In 2009, the Lab Coordinator attended the ACTLA in San Diego

Topics of discussion included:

- Tutor Training
- Tutor Leadership
- Facilitating group tutoring sessions
- Online tutoring
- Assessment

In January of 2010, the Lab Coordinator and Manager met with Nadine Rosenthal from San Francisco City College for in-service on assessment .

Professional Development for Tutors

Tutor Training for all new tutors at LMC currently consists of three components: Pre-semester training, ongoing semester length training, and additional training provided on Blackboard. All new tutors are required to attend all facets of the training in order to continue as tutor. The Pre-semester training

consists of two days for a total of 12 hours. The pre-semester training is designed to train on study skills, diversity, ethics and the Socratic/inquiry method. The ongoing semester length training continues to work on these skills and addresses areas of concerns that tutors experience throughout the semester. Since the cost of training can be expensive, in Fall 2012, we included additional training/information to be delivered through Blackboard. This has allowed us to cut some of the workshops while maintaining our tutor training standards.

In order to review and evaluate the workshops, tutors are asked to evaluate the two-day pre-semester and each training. The tutors are asked to evaluate each section of tutor training and tell us what worked, and what could be improved. We also ask tutors to rate the training workshop on a scale of 1-10. The feedback given is used to help us plan future tutor trainings. Evaluations: past three years, summary and effectiveness> 8.5 score for overall effectiveness.

Collaboration

Describe any current collaboration efforts that are occurring between your unit/program and other units and programs both inside and outside of Student Services.

The college –wide tutoring program is a collaborative between all departments that use tutoring on campus which includes Math, Sciences, English, Puente, UMOJA, MESA, Music, Business/Computer Science. All decisions that impact college-wide tutoring involve all areas that receive tutoring through the Tutor Support Team (TST). In the past five years, the Center for Academic Support Coordinator has worked with individual departments to assess their tutoring needs and mode of delivery. As a result, the total number of tutors supporting college departments has increased from 14 college departments to 26 departments. The Center now offers peer tutoring services for many G.E Courses such as Art/ Art, Music, History, Political Science, History, Psychology, Anatomy/Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences, and for CTE courses, specifically Business, ETEC, and nursing.

The tutoring program also collaborates with the Transfer Academy (formally the Avid program) on campus. In Fall 2012, we began a small pilot program with 2 Transfer Academy classes. For spring 2013, the Transfer Academy and tutoring are working to (ACS class) create small study groups for AVID students with trained tutors/mentors from last semester’s AVID classes. It is hoped that this pilot will lead to a tutoring component for the Transfer Academy in the fall 2013.

For the past 2 years, the tutoring program has also worked with Antioch and Pittsburg middle and high schools to provide tutoring support for their AVID courses. Unfortunately, due to budget cuts, Antioch Unified School District is no longer able to support this program. However, the tutoring program still contracts tutors to Rancho Medanos Middle School in Pittsburg for both the AVID and Reading Naturally programs.

Annual Review Update Analysis

Analyze your annual reviews (objectives and improvements) over the past 4 years and respond to the feedback from last year's review.

We very much appreciated the feedback provided and have tried to make needed corrections in this year's review. We have particularly tried to differentiate goals, objectives and activities.

Strategic Priorities

Describe which strategic priorities (District or college) you feel are most applicable to your unit/program and how your unit/program plans to participate in supporting these priorities.

The Center for Academic Support will provide support for the below district and college strategic goals:

District Goal #1: Student Learning and Success (emphasis on closing achievement gap)

LMC Strategic Priorities:

#1: Increase And Accelerate Student Program Completion

#2: Promote Faculty, Staff, and Student Engagement

3 : Increase and Accelerate Student Completion of Basic Skills Sequences

The provision of individual faculty consultation and peer tutoring is a much needed academic support for students as they seek assistance in achieving their academic goals. Research consistently shows that students who seek out academic support are more successful in completing their coursework and achieving their goal. One reason for this is the personal engagement that is provided in settings like the Center for Academic Support. Because we see students individually, we are often able to provide on the spot advice and guidance as needed, often referring students to other college resources such as counseling.

Long Term Goals

Using the above analysis, develop longer term (5 year) goals that you plan on addressing in your annual unit/program review updates (3 – 5 goals recommended).

1. Improve access to, and quality of college wide tutoring
2. Improve access to, and quality of student learning through individualized faculty consultation on reading and writing across the curriculum.
3. Promote Student Engagement
4. Assist Students with successful course completion